

STAFFORD COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

July 7, 2010

The meeting of the Stafford County Planning Commission of Wednesday, July 7, 2010, was called to order at 6:36 p.m. by Chairman Gordon Howard in the Board of Supervisors Chambers of the County Administrative Center.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Howard, Fields, Rhodes, Hazard, Mitchell, Kirkman and Hirons

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF PRESENT: Harvey, Roberts, Stinnette, Baker, Zuraf, Ansong, Hess, Hornung and Bullington

DECLARATIONS OF DISQUALIFICATION

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. CUP2900195; Conditional Use Permit - Stafford Lakes Service Center - A request for a Conditional Use Permit to allow vehicle fuel sales in the B-2, Urban Commercial Zoning District as well as within the Highway Corridor (HC) Overlay District on Assessor's Parcel 44-75 consisting of 0.96 acres, located on the north side of Warrenton Road and the east side of Berea Church Road within the Falmouth Election District. **(Time Limit: September 14, 2010) (History - Deferred at June 16, 2010 Meeting to July 7, 2010, for meeting with Mr. Hirons, staff and the applicant)**

Mr. Howard: Tonight on the agenda the first item that we have is the CUP2900195 which is the Conditional Use Permit for Stafford Lakes Service Center. Mr. Hess?

Mr. Hess: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you Commission members. Staff brings back to you Conditional Use Permit 2900195, Conditional Use Permit for Stafford Lakes Service Center. There are several attachments that were given to you with this memo. There was a meeting held on June 23rd with Commissioner Hirons and Commissioner Hazard, the applicant, engineer, owner and Planning and Zoning staff to discuss the proposed Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Generalized Development Plan for this site and to also talk about transportation related issues. It was in the best interest of everyone to have the applicant submit the GDP for the existing conditions for Phase 1 and Phase 2 to give a better illustration of what exactly is changing from one phase to the next. So, that's why you have a paper copy version of the existing conditions and the mylar version of the two proposed phases. You can lay them on top of each other and see how the project is to evolve and change over the course of time. The applicant also submitted a cover letter with two attached emails; those emails were correspondence between the Virginia Department of Transportation and the applicant and County staff talking about access points for Phase 1 and talking about how they would not meet access management standards under Appendix F. However, the applicant could apply for a spacing exception at site plan stage. There was also talk about concern about in the future, when the widening of Warrenton Road takes place, there would be a concern with the right out onto Warrenton Road crossing so many lanes to do a U-turn at the signal where Berea Church Road and Warrenton Road come together. The applicant also finally submitted proposed revisions to staff's proposed conditions for this project. The revisions were specifically on conditions 2, 5 and 8, and they proposed a new condition, 5A, where we explained in the memo what each of those revisions were and explained the new condition 5A. Then staff went

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

onto evaluate the new condition and the proposed revisions and did not support the revisions to condition 2, 5 and the newly proposed 5A. So, with that we, however, we did support the revision to condition 8. So we revised the Resolution which is Attachment 4 so you could see that. And then staff also provided a letter from the Zoning Administrator which is dated, I believe, June 23, 2009, which discussed the existing canopy or confirms more or less that the existing canopy is a nonconforming structure. And the reason why this was brought up is because there is the proposal to remove the existing canopy, replace it with a new canopy and with that there was a code section that was pointed out to you, Section 28-173(c) which talks about nonconformities. And it goes on to say that the new canopy would have to conform to the B-2 Zoning District setbacks so, therefore, it couldn't take advantage of the nonconforming status that the existing canopy has today. And that was Attachment 6; that was a recently passed Ordinance that had that section of the code. It was D, now it's C, so we just wanted to point that out to you. And then lastly, staff provided you two pictures of the site so you can get an accurate depiction or better sense of what the property looks like as far as Warrenton Road, the canopy and the existing auto service center. And, after all that, staff still supports going to Phase 2 of this development and skipping past Phase 1. So, with that, I will take any questions.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Hess. I will bring it back to the Planning Commissioners. Are there any questions of staff?

Mr. Hirons: I wanted to thank both the applicant and staff for the meeting that we did have. It was very useful. I'm still... maybe it's me but this is still a very tricky one to me. I still don't think I fully understand the complete impacts of either Phase 1 or Phase 2. Joey, can you describe a little bit more in detail on the canopy issue, in particular, with Phase 1? Because from the, I know we discussed this quite a bit, but from our overlays they're not using the existing canopy but they're using the footings of the existing canopy?

Mr. Hess: I believe when they first came to the Zoning Administrator for a determination or ruling, they were looking to turn the canopy and they were told that they would have to use the existing footers and posts and couldn't expand the canopy but they could turn it. So, I think they were looking for something different that time. I think Debrarae would probably be better to answer that question what they were doing back in 2009. With this plan, they were looking to take down the canopy and turn it but use different footers. And she can correct me if I'm wrong on this one because we did talk about it and we did say that if they wanted to keep it as close as they were proposing to Warrenton Road, they would have to use the existing footers and posts as stated in that determination letter from 2009. So, that's kind of where we're at right now. So if they do remove the canopy and replace it and they're looking to do new posts or footers in the ground, they would be held to the B-2 forty foot setback.

Mr. Hirons: Which they don't meet.

Mr. Hess: Correct. And this also takes into consideration that at site plan they would be required to dedicate the full requested right-of-way, seventy-six feet from centerline. So that would further encroach on their property and make the setback ability impossible.

Mr. Hirons: Okay.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair? The seventy-six foot right-of-way that you're describing, is that road widening on the current Transportation Plan?

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Hess: It is. It's on the map itself; it calls for an eight-lane divided facility.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay. And you're saying it would be with that right-of-way it would be impossible for them to meet the setback requirements.

Mr. Hess: Under Phase 1, to have the canopy and the auto service center.

Ms. Kirkman: But the right-of-way hasn't been taken, is that correct?

Mr. Hess: But it will be taken. It will be required at site plan; if they were to submit a site plan for Phase 1.

Ms. Kirkman: Can they request a variance for that?

Mr. Hess: Yes.

Ms. Kirkman: And isn't that exactly the kind of circumstance, particularly when it's imposed on the property owner rather than at their own making, isn't that exactly the kind of situation that variances are made for?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Harvey, or Mrs. Roberts.

Mrs. Roberts: Ms. Kirkman, I don't think that's an appropriate question for him. He certainly doesn't know the intent of what the Board passed the Ordinance is.

Ms. Kirkman: Well, is that one of the criteria for a variance, that it be not of the applicant's own making?

Mrs. Roberts: Yes.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Any other questions Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: Not at this time.

Mr. Howard: Okay, thank you. Any other Commissioners have any questions? Mr. Hirons?

Mr. Hirons: Will we have the opportunity to speak to the applicant?

Mr. Howard: We will, after any questions for staff we'll bring the applicant up. I think we're good right now Mr. Hess. We'll ask the applicant to come forward.

Ms. Karnes: Good evening Commissioners and staff. For the record, my name is Debrarae Karnes with Leming and Healy and I represent the applicant. Mr. Howard, I was thinking I could give a small presentation.

Mr. Howard: I think that would be helpful.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Ms. Karnes: Okay. I'm not going to belabor what we've already talked about, but I'd like to clear up what seems to be some continuing confusion. First of all, our office contacted the Zoning Administrator in late 2008 basically to say we have a client and he wants to put in gas pumps here. Can he do it and still use the existing canopy and the existing building if he can make it work? And the answer was yes he can because they're nonconforming, but he can't move the canopy in any way. Shortly thereafter we decided we couldn't make circulation work with that existing canopy. And so, we are proposing a new canopy that is far less intrusive than the existing canopy which is like five feet away from the existing right-of-way. And it is not forty feet away from the right-of-way as staff says. But I want to discuss that and I'll do that right now, because I think this is going to get to the heart of the matter. One of staff's main points is that there is not enough room for the canopy and the existing building and the ultimate right-of-way of seventy-six feet. And they say Phase 1 cannot work because dedication of the full right-of-way will be required at site plan and to show that requirement they quote Section 28-256 of the Zoning Ordinance which is on page 1 of my handout. And I'm pausing here momentarily while Commissioner Hiron gets his copy. And you see I've highlighted it in yellow. But the pertinent part is, and I'll read it, "the subdivider", because this Ordinance really seems to be aimed at people creating new subdivisions but let's not even go there, "the subdivider shall be required to dedicate at least one-half of the right-of-way necessary to make horizontal and vertical adjustments to such street". And we have two points to make here. First of all, the requirement is that the necessary right-of-way be dedicated, and our argument is that VDOT will not require the right-of-way be dedicated until such time that Warrenton Road is to be built. And we provided for that dedication of right-of-way. In one of the conditions we provided the applicant agrees to execute a deed dedicating the right-of-way to VDOT at the time of VDOT's Phase 3 at no cost and the County is to hold that in escrow. This is a win-win situation, otherwise the County... I'm sorry... VDOT will have to acquire the right-of-way and pay market value for it at the time of the road expansion. We submit that the ultimate right-of-way, those words were never used here; it's right-of-way necessary. And furthermore, it goes on to say to make horizontal and vertical adjustments in such street. And we're arguing that that means if there's any improvements to be done, for instance in Phase 1 the applicant is building a turn lane along the entire frontage of the site, that's the type of right-of-way that is necessary to be dedicated at site plan and the applicant is doing it. So, as part of Phase 1, there will be enough right-of-way dedicated to build that improvement. We disagree with staff; this Ordinance has been in some shape or form been in the Zoning Ordinance since 1983. And I think you have to read it from that perspective. I'm not sure how extended the County's transportation planning was in 1983. That's why we feel comfortable that Phase 1 provides adequate right-of-way dedication for the County and VDOT, Phase 2 provides the ultimate right-of-way dedication needed for the County in their Transportation Plan, and I do not believe, quite frankly, that in every case since 1983 the County has secured ultimate right-of-way. And so, I think this is a policy that is subject to interpretation. Going onto the other issue that has come up, the forty foot setback; now, this issue really first came up in our discussions last Thursday. And if you look at the staff report, staff says the new canopy within Phase 1 can't meet forty foot setbacks required in 28-38(c). And so I have reprinted 28-38(c) on page 3 of your handout. And I think there's some confusion here also. I'm not sure whether it's just a mistake in the citation or whether there is some bottom line confusion. Section 28-38 talks about buffer yards which is the landscaping either between parcels when they don't have the same type of zoning or in front of a parcel. And it goes on to say at (c), "no accessory building and/or structure, except for walls, fences and signs shall be located in any front yard or street". And if you read that literally, I guess that means you can't have gas tanks for any gas station anywhere in the County. But that's just confusing. You have to cross reference the design and construction manual provision which is on page 5 and you look and this property fronts Warrenton Road which is an arterial road. The buffer yard requirement is twenty-five feet which we are providing. So we meet the requirements of 28-38. The issue that the County is talking about is the front setback that begins on page 6a. I have identified the standards for

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

B-2 that are in the Zoning Ordinance. And if you leaf through this and get to page 6d, you'll get the minimum yard for the front setback is forty feet. That's where we're getting that. Now, what is a setback? We turn to page 7 and look at the definitions in the Zoning Ordinance and it says "setback, see building line". When you look at building line, it's "a line on a lot... located a sufficient distance therefrom to provide the minimum yards required by this chapter". It's also called a "building restriction line". And the point is, buildings have to be forty feet away from the right-of-way, not necessarily all kinds of structures. A building has a roof and is enclosed within exterior walls or fire walls. A canopy is not a building. We submit that the use of the forty feet setback requirement is inapplicable here but, don't just go by me, Rachel Hudson has interpreted this, on page 8 and 9, and she was specifically looking at how you employ these lot lines for lots that had frontage on more than one street. And that, you know, is typical of this site. And if you look at page 9, she gives examples of how to calculate this. And it's all based on the distance between the building and the right-of-way. We have twenty-five feet between the right-of-way that we're dedicating in Phase 1 and the pumps. It doesn't meet the forty feet but I suggest to you the forty feet is inapplicable and applying it to buildings only is consistent with Mrs. Hudson's interpretation here, as well as in a recent case we had with her concerning something that only covered cars over the front, but without walls; a carport. Other new information; you got the email copies from Clyde Hamrick because his earlier comments indicated there would be a problem with the Warrenton Road entrance, both at Phase 1 and Phase 2. His comments indicate there will be no problem with that entrance on Phase 1. At Phase 2 there may a need to make it a right in entrance only. He also mentions that there may be a need for some exceptions through the VDOT process for the intersection spacing, but that is again a site plan issue. And finally, his memo brought up requirement for gas tanks to be located a certain distance away. I think it said something like gas tanks located perpendicular to the right-of-way had to be at least thirty feet from the right-of-way. And ours in Phase 1 is twenty-five feet. Our engineer did some research today and talked to Clyde and, in fact, it's not thirty feet from right-of-way, it's thirty feet from edge of pavement. And so Phase 1 meets that requirement as well. In addition, Phase 2 meets all these requirements. There is no issue at all regarding distance from right-of-way for the gas tanks, the gas pumps, circulation, the canopy, no issue there. I'm not sure whether I've addressed all the questions or not but I hit the issues I thought were important and I will be glad to answer other questions.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission for questions of the applicant.

Mr. Fields: Mr. Chairman, I'm trying to get my head around this. So, in Phase 1 with the gas pumps where they are, they will be how far from the edge of the road?

Ms. Karnes: They will be twenty-five feet away from the edge of the road as measured from the dedication of a total of sixty-four feet of right-of-way.

Mr. Fields: The edge of the existing road. When the road is widened, right, that's when the relocation, Phase 2, occurs.

Ms. Karnes: Exactly. We're donating at Phase 1 three feet of right-of-way.

Mr. Fields: If this is built now, Phase 1 being built as soon as possible with the road that's in place, how far are the pumps from the existing edge of the existing road?

Ms. Karnes: You keep saying existing...

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Fields: Well, the road as it sits now. You're going to build Phase 1 with the road as it sits right now.

Ms. Karnes: No...

Mr. Howard: No, they're going to build a deceleration lane as well.

Mr. Fields: Okay, well, after the deceleration lane.

Ms. Karnes: After the deceleration lane and the additional three feet...

Mr. Fields: But the functional road that will be in place...

Ms. Karnes: Twenty-five feet.

Mr. Fields: Twenty-five feet. And Mr. Hamrick said thirty feet was necessary?

Ms. Karnes: Oh, wait a minute...

Mr. Howard: You want to let your engineer answer that?

Myon Yoo: Thirty-six feet.

Mr. Fields: Thirty-six feet from the edge of the pavement, of the deceleration lane.

Mr. Yoo: From the edge to the proposed gas pump.

Mr. Fields: Okay. Thank you. And VDOT said thirty feet was what their minimum was?

Mr. Yoo: Yes sir.

Ms. Karnes: Yes.

Mr. Fields: Okay. My main concern here is just there is an obvious safety issue of proximity of gas pumps to cars hurdling down the highway out of control. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: And we do have some issues on Route 17. Any other questions? Mr. Hirons, you had a question?

Mr. Hirons: I think what I'd really like, Mr. Chairman... I apologize, I've been suffering from a summertime cold which is wonderful to have in hundred degree weather... Mr. Chairman, I think what's happening right now, what's going on, is I really like Mr. Harvey's kind of explanation...

Mr. Howard: Well, I have questions for staff as well as a follow-up, but I just want to just make sure if there are any questions for the applicant. Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: Ms. Karnes, could you just explain... part of this goes back to a determination made by the Zoning Administrator. Did you all agree with that determination? I still don't understand because of the definitional issues why it wasn't appealed.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Ms. Karnes: We agreed with her determination that we could not relocate the canopy. We did not agree, and we had never asked the question about whether it had to meet the setback, the building line setback; all we had asked was whether we could use the existing canopy. And she came back and said we could use it as long as we didn't move it. It seems that that zoning determination letter is being used to argue more than we believed she was rendering an opinion on. We did not see that opinion being rendered to say that a canopy is a building; in fact, she calls it a structure.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Any other questions of the applicant? Seeing no one making a motion or an indication, thank you Ms. Karnes, I will turn it back to staff. We have some additional follow-up questions for staff, Mr. Hess and Mr. Harvey. Mr. Hirons, you had some questions for Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Hirons: Yeah, I think probably what sounds like some others may have. Just kind of the background on the interpretation of these things that Ms. Karnes mentioned and brought in and questioned of why they were applied the way they were applied in this case.

Mr. Harvey: Ms. Karnes accurately described how the questioning and the answer went with regard to the fuel pumps. The fuel pump canopy, I don't recall there being any discussion about whether a new canopy or not has to meet setback. That's something that's been through the development review process for a long time. We look at the Section 28-38 which is the performance regulations and it talks about buffers, corner lots and also the case of accessory buildings and structures. And the way the Zoning Administrator is looking at this canopy, this is an accessory structure to the sale of motor vehicle fuel. There are places where you don't have a canopy necessarily on fuel sales but most of those are wholesale-type of activities rather than retail. But, generally speaking, the way staff has dealt with the Ordinance and review of site plans is that a canopy is an accessory structure and would have to comply with the setbacks as per 28-38. Does that answer your question?

Mr. Howard: So, Mr. Harvey, are you saying that 28-38, section (c), where obviously we're considering the canopy an accessory structure and that that structure, as depicted on the plan before us this evening, the site plan does not meet the requirements under 28-38(c)? Is that based on staff's interpretation?

Mr. Harvey: The way the GDP currently looks, that is correct. We had some discussion about the Highway Corridor District in that it allows you to reduce the setback up to fifty percent if you locate the parking to the side or to the rear of the structure or the building. We are looking at it in terms of could that possibly work in this case, but it wasn't clear that it was going to meet that requirement to give the setback relief.

Mr. Howard: So, what would the total setback, in terms of footage, be in this circumstance? Mr. Hess, do you have that? And this is the setback for the canopy, not the pumps.

Mr. Hess: Sorry, what was the question again?

Mr. Howard: What would the total setback requirement be for this applicant... it's not clear to me on the site plan what the distance is because I'm seeing a few numbers. One does say forty feet and one says thirty feet, but it's not necessarily a correlating site. That's what I don't understand. So, what's the total setback requirement in this particular case? Based on 28-38(c).

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Hess: Right; 28-38, which is coming from the County Ordinance, would be the forty foot setback that is required under the B-2 Zoning District. That's a front yard setback measurement. I believe the thirty feet which you're referencing is a VDOT setback requirement which we found out tonight is the distance from the edge of pavement to the actual fuel pumps. Does that clarify the forty and the thirty?

Mr. Howard: It's still not clear to me. So, the applicant indicates it's thirty-six feet from the end of the pavement to the structure, is that correct? And you're saying we're using a different criteria to understand the difference. So, is there really a difference of only four feet?

Mr. Hess: Well, I believe we're talking about thirty-six feet from the edge of pavement, which is going to be the new right turn lane going to the actual pumps themselves. We're also talking about from the front yard property line back to the canopy has to be forty feet. So, they're not meeting the forty foot setback with the canopy, from the front property line to the canopy itself. Because it sounds like they're meeting VDOT standards which is talking about the actual pumps underneath the canopy from edge of pavement. So, we're doing two different connections here, two different lines.

Mr. Howard: So, the canopy actually is larger than the size of the pump area.

Mr. Hess: Yes.

Mr. Howard: So there's obviously an overhang on the sides. Okay. And then Ms. Karnes made a reference that I guess based on her experience in the County that 28-256 actually is typically applied, and she specifically referenced I think it was (c)(1) where this is typically applied to subdivisions. And, what I was wondering, the question is for staff, how often have we applied this same Ordinance in Stafford or this regulation in Stafford to a business versus a subdivision site plan?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, as a matter of course with review of site plans, it's standard practice to require right-of-way based on our Comprehensive Plan. And typically that's something that is done through a dedication plat. In almost all cases, VDOT will require that that right-of-way be dedicated prior to them signing the site plan. As Ms. Karnes had indicated, there have been differing widths of right-of-way people have donated or dedicated with their site plan application. In some cases we have, for instance, on Route 1, it's been in our long range plan for a number of years as a six-lane divided facility. We don't have any specific plans for how wide that right-of-way would be. We have an old functional plan that VDOT drafted which showed a right-of-way of 160 feet or eighty feet from centerline. In some cases, we've accepted less than that amount because we don't have any detailed specific plans and the Comprehensive Plan typical section is a guide, it's not a hundred percent specific. In this case, from a staff perspective, we have a preliminary design by VDOT, they've indicated to us what right-of-way is going to be necessary from centerline through the section of Route 17, and that's the basis for the staff's recommendation as to why we would need this much right-of-way dedicated at the time of the site plan approval.

Mr. Howard: Right, and so a follow-up to that is how much of the project is actually funded today. It's a project I know that is on the books, so to speak, but do you know how much of that is actually funded?

Mr. Harvey: I don't know how much is actually funded.

Mr. Howard: Is anything funded?

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Harvey: Yes, there is funding on the project. The Board is looking at requesting additional funding through bonus obligation funds, but that will be still small increments. It will still take a number of years before all the money is collected for ultimate construction. What I've been told is that VDOT may start the land acquisition process as soon as two years. A lot of that, again, will depend on funding.

Mr. Howard: Right. Are there any other questions for staff? Thank you Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Hirons: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Condition 5a, specifically. Were there any specific concerns with that? I think Mrs. Roberts may have had... did you have any concerns with that, in particular, the deeding?

Mrs. Roberts: I certainly could not recommend to any client to accept a deed in easement just because be enforceable by the County?

Mrs. Roberts: No, I'm not saying it wouldn't be enforceable, I'm saying if something happens and they have liens against their property that is recorded prior to our title being recorded, then we would take it subject to those liens...

Mr. Howard: Other obligations being paid off.

Mrs. Roberts: Correct. Or if something happens and they end up transferring title and it gets recorded before us, we are second in line or not in line and all and we would have to pursue legal action.

Mr. Howard: Is there a recommendation from you as the County Attorney on what they could do differently to make us feel more comfortable with that?

Mrs. Roberts: Not in light of what they're seeking. I could not recommend any client to accept a title in escrow.

Mr. Howard: Okay, thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, after listening to all this, if staff could just articulate what the concern is given that the applicant has said... particularly given that there's not full funding for this project, and I think there's a fairly substantial shortfall in the funding...

Mr. Howard: Yeah, I was wondering the percentage myself.

Ms. Kirkman: Yeah, it was published somewhere recently.

Mr. Fields: I just saw it not too long ago.

Ms. Kirkman: Yeah, it was a pretty substantial shortfall. And the applicant has said as soon as the project is clearly a go they will change the project to Phase 2. So, given the applicant's willingness to put that agreement to paper, I just don't understand what staff's objections to Phase 1 are. If they could, like in a nutshell, explain that.

Mrs. Roberts: Their suggestion, or what I understand, their proposal is to deed the required VDOT easement or VDOT right-of-way to put it in escrow but not record it. While it's in escrow and they

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

can't revoke it, if they transfer it to someone else or if there are liens against the property in the meantime before it gets recorded, it will not be clear title.

Ms. Kirkman: Yeah, I understand those concerns Mrs. Roberts. Let's just set aside that piece for the moment. If the rest of the conditions on the application very clearly state the applicant will move to Phase 2...

Mrs. Roberts: And if the applicant does not develop this or if the applicant should happen to lose the property via foreclosure or whatever, I'm just... legally he can do it.

Ms. Kirkman: But the conditions run with the...

Mrs. Roberts: I just cannot recommend it.

Ms. Kirkman: But I'm not talking about the specific condition.

Mr. Howard: I think you're right, Ms. Kirkman. I think it would convey with the property as well. That's the normal occurrence. And I think you're asking a different question though, right?

Ms. Kirkman: Right, that's correct. I'm not asking about that specific condition; I'm trying to understand why staff objects to Phase 1 given that the applicant has said when VDOT's ready to go on the project, they'll move to Phase 3.

Mrs. Roberts: Oh, I believe that space on the Ordinance, but I will let Mr. Harvey speak to that.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman and Ms. Kirkman. The staff's opinion is that our Ordinance would require them to dedicate the right-of-way at the time of site plan approval. It would be the first site plan that gets approved. So, therefore, from that aspect, we feel like based on the drawings as they exist today, they may not be able to meet setback for the canopy. Now, there may be some way that if they want to put in pumps without a canopy or they get final engineering and we know more information at that point in time and it fits on the property, then that would be totally appropriate for them to move forward with Phase 1. But given the information that we know now, staff is basing its recommendation on the requirement to dedicate right-of-way and the setback.

Ms. Kirkman: In the Subdivision Ordinance, which I'm more familiar with, there's a provision in there that the Planning Director can waive requirements of the Subdivision Ordinance. Is there a similar provision regarding site plans?

Mr. Harvey: Site plan issues are part of the Zoning Ordinance which would be through the Zoning Administrator and Board of Zoning Appeals.

Ms. Kirkman: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Ms. Kirkman. A similar question though, Mr. Harvey. In the past when an applicant is going through the CUP process and they've agreed basically to all the conditions, but yet a condition may exist or might be created that's nonconforming, have we allowed that in the past? Because the conditions are spelled out fairly well. I think the applicant did a good job on what the intent is for the business. So, that's my question. In other words, we have conditions in here; that's what a CUP does. So, recognizing that that's the case, if we change the dedication of the right-of-way

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

but allow the nonconformity recognizing that they'll have to go to Phase 2 should all of a sudden the funding develop for the widening of Warrenton Road, which they're agreeing to.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, generally the Zoning Ordinance has provisions that if you have two conflicting requirements, the most restrictive applies. So, through that construct, if the Board knowingly or accidentally passed a proffer or a CUP condition that was in violation of the Ordinance, they'd still be bound to abide by the Ordinance.

Mr. Howard: So, I guess the real question is, and maybe Mrs. Roberts can answer this, I guess we're going back to the 28-256 which is the one, I guess it's item 1 on there, when a site development plan abuts any side of a public street which is in the state highway system or maintained by the County or which is proposed by the Comprehensive Plan of the County, the subdivider shall be required to dedicate at least one-half of the right-of-way necessary to make horizontal and vertical adjustments to such street. And that's what you're referring to which creates that seventy-five feet? Is that right?

Mr. Harvey: That's correct.

Mr. Howard: So, is seventy-five feet the entire right-of-way or is that one-half of the right-of-way as suggested in the text I just read?

Mr. Harvey: We understand that to be one-half section or from centerline.

Mr. Howard: So, the actual required right-of-way in this case would be 150 feet from centerline?

Mr. Harvey: My understanding would be roughly twice that amount. It may vary a little bit based on where you are located along that section of roadway.

Mr. Howard: And again, just going back to one of your original statements, Mr. Harvey, that this is sort of approximate because there is a plan, it's an old plan albeit, of the street widening at some point of Warrenton Road and right now we're sort of taking a best guess at what the actual requirement would be. Is that fair to say?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. Chairman, in this case we're going off of information we have from VDOT based on preliminary engineering. It's not complete final engineering yet, so things may adjust a little bit. There may be more right-of-way or less right-of-way depending upon the ultimate design.

Mr. Howard: Maybe that was the Route 1 example I was thinking of that you used then. This is a preliminary engineering plan that VDOT has for that particular roadway.

Mr. Harvey: Yes. And this is the best available information we have today.

Mr. Howard: So, Mrs. Roberts, I guess it's fair to say even if we approve this tonight that the Board could approve or deny but, if it went through the process that the most strictest Ordinance would prevail in any case.

Mrs. Roberts: Correct.

Mr. Howard: So, in any case, the applicant's out the money for the CUP request, right? Because even if the CUP is denied, the applicant still pays the fee?

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mrs. Roberts: If the CUP is approved and it violates an Ordinance, the most restrictive I believe we do have that in our Ordinance; so yes, they would be out the money.

Mr. Harvey: Again, Mr. Chairman, that pertains to Phase 1. It does not necessarily apply to Phase 2. Phase 2, staff's in complete support of that proposal. We feel that it meets the Ordinance requirements.

Mr. Howard: Right. Okay, any other questions of staff from the Planning Commission? Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: So, just to get back to the question I had asked earlier, is one way for the applicant to resolve this to apply for a variance?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Ms. Kirkman, I believe that is the case. They could apply for a variance and if they're successful receiving the variance, that could make this a viable project.

Mr. Fields: Phase 1.

Mr. Harvey: Phase 1, correct.

Mr. Hirons: Can you help me with that process a little bit of applying for a variance? When does that come into play and when does it actually happen?

Mr. Howard: Mr. Harvey?

Mr. Harvey: Certainly. A variance is a relaxation of the Zoning Ordinance standards. The Board of Zoning Appeals would issue that or consider that after conducting a public hearing. They'll look at the findings of fact based on the available information that they have. As Ms. Kirkman said earlier, there has to be a hardship shown and the hardship generally is not the making of the property owner. There may be some unique circumstances with the property. The Board of Zoning Appeals can either grant or deny the variance request. Usually a variance request would come after you have the zoning in place for whatever building or use that you're looking to build on the property.

Ms. Kirkman: So, and Mr. Harvey, have we... it seems to me we have approved plans where there's been a plan note that said variance will be needed. In fact, we had a rezoning... the quarry rezoning application was clearly going to need a variance in order to move forward. Why can't this application move forward with some note regarding the need for a variance the way the quarry rezoning application did?

Mr. Harvey: Well, from a staff perspective, we're making a recommendation. It certainly can move forward and maybe ultimately that's the way the Board approves the application, with a notation that a variance would be required in order to construct Phase 1... or may be required.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Okay, any other discussion? Mrs. Hazard?

Mr. Hazard: It appears from also what we have in here, a variance would be one of the things potentially required if we approve this, but there is also that VDOT Access Management Spacing Exception as I understood. And maybe Mr. Hess can speak to that or the applicant. But there's an additional requirement that's also out there. I'm just trying to get in my mind all the things that the

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

applicant, if we were to go forward, needs to pursue so that we are, or so I feel I know what burdens are being placed on them as well. And I don't know the... based on Mr. Hamrick's email...

Mr. Howard: Right. So the question for staff, and Mr. Hess or Mr. Harvey can answer, is at the previous meeting where this came before us there was a rendering from VDOT that showed a cut through the property. And Mrs. Hazard is asking where is that in this presentation today and is that part of what's being proffered as well? Or will that end up being another issue for the applicant?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, I believe the diagram that you're referring to is again another concept in which VDOT is currently studying for access for this property and some other properties in the immediate area. We don't know exactly what's going to come out in the final design. VDOT still has to conduct its public hearing. With regard to meeting the access requirements and the need for an exception, right now that would be the case if they wanted to move forward in advance of the VDOT road project being constructed. I will note in the case of a similar issue that came up recently for the car wash on White Oak Road, we had a situation where the entrances, as they existed today, did not meet the VDOT spacing requirements. The VDOT representatives acknowledged that they had to provide access to that property. So, as Ms. Karnes said in her presentation, there's a number of things that will have to be answered when the site plan actually is submitted and a request for an exception is also submitted to VDOT.

Mr. Howard: Okay, thank you. Mrs. Hazard, does that answer the concern?

Mrs. Hazard: Yes. I just wanted to make sure that we saw that there were additional requirements and Mr. Hamrick's email that was provided to us does say both fail to meet it and you may wish to file an access management spacing exception request. So, there is still another hurdle in my mind that they need to make sure that we are aware of.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Any other questions of staff? If not, Mr. Hirons, this is in your magisterial district.

Mr. Hirons: It's close enough to Hartwood, Mrs. Hazard, if you'd like it. I'm still a little bit perplexed or confused and not sure what direction to go here. I think Phase 2 is kind of the answer as I understand that the applicant though can't afford to go to Phase 2 right away and doesn't want to do that and will withdraw or change the application in some way if that were the case. However, now it sounds like perhaps to get it through out process, some sort of notation of variance required might be acceptable with the Phase 1 plan as it is. Or some sort of change to Phase 1 to not include a canopy... somewhere along those lines. I think I would actually prefer to defer it yet again. I think we're still well within the time limit...

Mr. Howard: September 14th.

Mr. Hirons: ...to continue to kind of mull over it; perhaps see if the applicant has some changes they'd like to make to their Phase 1 plan to not bump into these issues or accept the variance notation option.

Mr. Howard: Are you making a motion to defer?

Mr. Hirons: I think I'm getting there, yes. I'd like to make a motion to defer the application for CUP2900195 until... our next meeting is I think plenty of time, which will be when?

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Howard: Well, we scheduled an additional meeting in July.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'm assuming, Mr. Hirons, you're referring to August 18th?

Mr. Hirons: August 18th is more than ample time and that's fine. I think that's a good point to bring this back. I now we'll be having some other discussion possibly during other meetings and such, so I think the August 18th would be the appropriate time. So, the motion is to defer until the August 18th meeting.

Mr. Howard: Is there a second?

Mr. Fields: Second.

Mrs. Hazard: Second.

Mr. Howard: Second. Any discussion? Hearing no discussion, I'll call for the vote. All those in favor of deferring CUP2900195 Stafford Lakes Service Center signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed say nay. The motion carries 7-0.

2. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (**Time Limit: September 7, 2010**) (**In Comp Plan Committee**) (**Deferred to July 7, 2010**)

Discussed after the Public Hearings.

3. Rappahannock River Overlay District and Potomac River Overlay District (Referred back by Board of Supervisors) (**Time Limit: October 6, 2010**) (**Deferred at June 16, 2010 Meeting to August 18, 2010**)
4. Discussion of Medical and Dental Clinics Definitions (**Time Limit: September 15, 2010**) (**Deferred to August 18, 2010**)
5. Redevelopment Area Plans - Boswell's Corner, Courthouse Road, Southern Gateway and Falmouth Village (Falmouth Village in Committee - Peter Fields and Scott Hirons) (**Deferred at June 16, 2010 Meeting to August 18, 2010**)

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

6. Reservoir Protection Overlay District (**Time Limit: January 29, 2010**) (**Deferred to August 18, 2010**)
7. COM1000010; Comprehensive Plan Compliance Review - Miracle Valley Lane Sanitary Sewer Extension - A request for review to determine compliance with the Comprehensive Plan in accordance with Section 15.2-2232 of the Code of Virginia (1950) as amended, for the extension of gravity sanitary sewer outside of the Urban Services Area a length of 505 linear feet to serve two residences, located on the north side of Deacon Road and east side of Grafton Village Elementary School on Assessor's Parcels 54-132, 54-133A and 54-133B within the Falmouth Election District. (**Time Limit: July 4, 2010**) (**History - Deferred at May 19, 2010 Meeting to June 2, 2010 Meeting**) (**Deferred at June 2, 2010 Meeting to October 6, 2010 Meeting**)

NEW BUSINESS

None

7:30 P.M.

PUBLIC PRESENTATIONS

Mr. Howard: We'll now go off the agenda from the unfinished business and open up the meeting for public presentations. There are also two public hearings this evening. There's a CUP1000133, Conditional Use Permit for B & J Auto Sales, and then there's also a public hearing for an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. Anyone wishing to address the Planning Commission may do so this evening, but during the public presentations we would ask that you not address the two items that are having a public hearing. You can address those during the public hearing. So, anyone wishing to speak on anything that is not a public hearing this evening may do so by stepping up to the podium. We ask that you state your name and your address. You'll have three minutes to address the Planning Commission. We do not address you back where we can get questions answered for you. We try to do that at the end of the public presentations. We can't always do that but we will try. Again, when you step up to the podium the green light will come on; that means you have three minutes to address us. When the yellow light comes on, that gives you about a minute left and then when the red light starts we would just ask that you conclude your remarks and allow the next speaker to speak. So, anyone wishing to address the Planning Commission this evening on any subject, other than the public hearings, may do so by stepping forward now. Thank you.

Ms. Kurpiel: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Board. My name is Patricia Kurpiel. I just wanted to say that I applaud you for trying to limit development in the new Comp Plan to 30,000 units. But my concern is how are you going to control that? How are you going to actually make sure that only 30,000 are built during that twenty year period? And my particular area of concern is the agricultural area. As you know, there are 13,000 by-right units out there that could be built and I see you have about 5,000 on your forecast. I think we all know that that's going to be the least expensive place to build as soon as development picks up and that's where the developers are going to go. So, what solution do you have to that problem? There's not going to be any PDR money, TDRs are a possibility, and what I want to discuss with you tonight is a TDR, Transfer of Development Rights, idea which has been used successfully, very successfully, in a jurisdiction like ours, the size of ours,

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

and very much like ours in Maryland. And here's what they did. Maryland downzoned the ag area; for example, like from one house on three to one house on ten, that would save 8,000 units in the agricultural area. The landowner is compensated. He is given a chit for that downzoning and he may use that chit; he may sell it to developers anytime he wishes. He might even wish to will it to his heirs. It doesn't have to be sold immediately. The developer who buys that chit, you need to require that your UDA's be built out with those chits. That will make sure that this system gets going. Now, will developers have to pay proffers after they have purchased these development rights? I think the answer to that has to be no because they have affectively relieved us, the taxpayers, of paying for infrastructure out in that ag area by buying those chits. And then we should be willing to move the payment for that infrastructure along with the chits that they've paid for. I think this solves a number of problems. If you look at the 20/20 report and also the survey that was done by the Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee, you will see that what citizens say they value most is a rural area, an area that preserves our natural resources which are many. And this plan would do that. Plus, it would populate your UDA's, I'm not saying that I am in complete agreement with where they are, but I'm asking you to open up your minds and at least consider that. And I'll be glad to send you the documentation if any of you wish to have it. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Reed: Good evening. My name is Becky Reed. I'd like to ask you to advocate for two public hearings on the Comp Plan, not a joint hearing. There have been so many changes in this document since there was much public participation. The nine UDA's is a tremendous change from the time that there was public participation and this public needs to know more about it. I'd also ask that you put the UDA consultants plan on the web so people can see it. I understand it does include multiple opportunities for public participation. And please don't pass this Comp Plan until the public participation has occurred. We really need to allow that. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Ms. Rollison: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, my name is Nan Rollison. I'm here tonight because I have grave concerns about the proposed revised Comprehensive Plan. As you know, this Comprehensive Plan will outline how and where development, roads, police, fire, rescue and other county services and environmental protection will proceed in Stafford County for the next twenty years. The previous Board of Supervisors approved a Comprehensive Plan that took over two years to work on, with multiple public hearings, emphasized smart growth, reduced dense cores, and at a cost, at least a taxpayer cost, at least of about \$300,000, not including staff time. Now we are changing and we are changing significantly. The revised plan which has been proposed and supported by the current Republican leadership has changed significantly by increasing the Urban Development Areas, the UDA's, from three areas to nine areas with no listing of the proposed amounts of residential housing units to be allowed. All this while we currently have a national backlog of new homes inventory, unsold new homes inventory, of about six months. All this without estimates of how much taxes will have to increase on citizens to pay for road maintenance, police, fire and rescue, and other county services needed to support this massive new unsustainable development. This revised Comprehensive Plan and its lack of specificity regarding the cost to taxpayers indicates a process that is highly questionable in terms of ethics, transparency of government and cost to taxpayers. The revised Comp Plan process will cost Stafford citizens another few hundred thousand dollars at a time when all county activities and services are being slashed to the bone. This revised Comp Plan process, proposed and supported by the current Republican leadership of Stafford, needs thorough scrutiny by the public and the media. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Mr. Waldowski: Paul Waldowski. I own property in the Rock Hill District, the Griffis-Widewater District and the Garrisonville District. And I too did read the revised Comp Plan and I think you're listening to some of the things I said, especially about storm pond management. I think you even put in there that you're even going to continue a storm pond management utility. Well, like I said to the Board of Supervisors last night, you can't continue something that you haven't started. And as I told you about storm ponds before, just because I'm a member of a corporation, which is an HOA, I should not be treated unfair and equitable. And let me explain to you, you know, while the country is going to approve our next Justice, let me give you some symbolism about the Lady of Justice. You know, she has those two scales and they're there to represent what's fair and equitable. But she also has blindfold and you, as Commissioners, need to do just like the Justice Department do, you need to be impartial. That means you need to take away your personal views of what's going on and address the views that are best for the County. Now I'm a big fan of rural, I'm also a big fan of supporting some of the other districts where I don't own property. And, but, you know, you have to give in a little bit also. I cannot believe that we elected this Republican majority and then I watch how the votes go. On the latest thing was the... if you saw your water and sewer bill, it just went up. Well, in 1981, your Planning Commission told the Board of Supervisors to pass Resolution R82-341 that was to grant me a water bill that I haven't got for nine years. And even on the site plan, going through the records in the Administration Building here, it even says that the Planning Commission site plan said I should have water and sewer. Now, in other developments, it has septic and well and those type entities. Now, the other thing that you brought up in the Comp Plan that really ticks me off is you did list the six commuter lots. And let me re-enforce to you that every time you use horizontal land and you don't take care of it vertically by putting in a vertical parking garage, then you need to go to all these commuter lots and watch how our rural areas are being destroyed by the decision-making of whoever's in charge that's in my abilities to change. Thank you.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Anyone else wishing to address the Planning Commission on anything but the two public hearings may do so by stepping forward. Seeing no one else in the building advancing, I will now close the public presentations and open up the public hearings. Thank you very much for your comments. We always appreciate citizens coming down and tonight we've had more citizens than we normally have. So, that's a good sign. We'll now open up the public hearings for CUP1000133 which is a Conditional Use Permit for B & J Auto Sales.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

8. CUP1000133; Conditional Use Permit - B & J Auto Sales - A request to amend an existing conditional use permit, specifically condition # 5 of Resolution R02-513, to allow retail sales of motor vehicles to occur in the M-1, Light Industrial Zoning District on Assessor's Parcel 54-66 consisting of 0.843 acres, located on the west side of Cool Spring Road approximately 2,000 feet south of White Oak Road within the George Washington Election District. The Conditional Use Permit currently restricts retail sales. **(Time Limit: October 5, 2010)**

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, please recognize Amy Ansong for the presentation.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Harvey.

Ms. Ansong: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. I stand before you tonight to present CUP1000133, B & J Auto Sales. Computer please. Tonight I'm presenting CUP1000133, B & J Auto Sales. The applicant is the Stafford County Board of Supervisors. The

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

subject parcel is Tax Map 54-66. It's located on the west side of Cool Spring Road and the site area is 0.843 acres. Tonight the request for the CUP is to amend condition number 5 in the existing CUP to allow motor vehicle retail sales activities. Currently, the current use on this parcel is wholesale motor vehicle sales. This is a depiction of the existing zoning for Tax Map 54-66. It is currently M-1. And this is the same parcel, just a map of the Land Use Plan for Tax Map 54-66. This is an aerial photograph of Tax Map 54-66, B & J Auto Sales. This is background. In November 2002, a CUP was approved for this parcel, Resolution R02-513, with eight conditions. And one of those conditions stated that the use of retail activity on this site shall be restricted. A few months ago the property was found to be in violation due to their retail activity and that is why the applicant is asking for that restriction on retail activity to be lifted here tonight. This is a GDP of the property. Here are some site photos of the property, Tax Map 54-66. This is the front of the property taken from Cool Spring Road. Here is another photo. Here is another photo. And, as I stated earlier, the applicant wants to simply lift the restriction on retail activity, so the proposed condition would read as the following: No service activity shall take place onsite. Also, there shall be no retail sales of automobile parts. Staff recommendation; staff believes the request with the amended conditions do meet the standards for issuance of the Conditional Use Permit. Staff recommends approval of the application with the conditions specified in Resolution R10-217. Any questions?

Mr. Howard: Thank you. I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission. Are there questions? Mr. Fields, I think this is in George Washington.

Mr. Fields: Yes. This comes out of a series of meetings we've had so I don't have any questions. If anybody would like, in addition to staff, if I can help any other Commissioners understand the background on this I will be happy to do so.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Any questions from any of the Commissioners on what's before us? There does not appear to be. Mrs. Hazard, did you have a question? No? Okay. Now we'll hear from the applicant.

Mr. Rhodes: We are the applicant.

Mr. Fields: We are the applicant.

Mr. Howard: We are the applicant. Okay, so we've heard from the applicant.

Mr. Fields: We've met the applicant and he is us.

Mr. Hirons: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that's my one question. Why are we the applicant?

Ms. Ansong: I believe the owner, the Van Hoys, after they received the violation they contacted perhaps a member of the Board of Supervisors and there was some discussion concerning this property. And so I believe based on those discussions the Stafford County Board of Supervisors decided to serve in the role of applicant for this application.

Mr. Hirons: I suppose maybe a little bit of background on the meetings? You participated, Mr. Fields?

Mr. Fields: Mr. Chairman, do you want me to...?

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Howard: Mr. Fields, that would be wonderful.

Mr. Fields: This is really very simple. It came about through the original CUP. I think it was the intent all along to have, basically Mr. Van Hoy, this is a hobby of his. He buys and sells four or five used cars at a time; that's what he likes to do. And actually, my understanding too, the way the code is written regarding the licensing of automobile sales is you don't really make the distinction between wholesale and retail because it's a difficult and almost unenforceable difference between exactly what, on a small scale. So this is simply readdressing what probably should have been taken care of a long time ago. They have no desire to expand into large scale vehicle sales. And so I think the Board felt that this was an example of just simply being an advocate for small business people with no reason to force them into a massive undertaking of expense to apply for this CUP when it was really probably, I won't say a misunderstanding, but probably maybe a miscommunication in the original CUP that didn't have this language in it in the first place. Nobody had thought anything about it until suddenly it occurred to somebody from Zoning, in their effort I guess to do their job, discovered that this didn't mesh. There has certainly never been a complaint about what the activity there... if you know Cool Spring Road, which I drive ten times a day, it's an industrial road. That's one of the corridors in that part of the County where industrial sales-type work is done so certainly there's nothing that's incompatible here with the surrounding area. That's the background; that's why the Board decided that it was probably (inaudible).

Mr. Howard: Mr. Hirons, does that answer your question?

Mr. Hirons: That answers the question, thank you.

Mr. Fields: Okay, thanks. Didn't mean to give you too much.

Mr. Howard: No, that was good. Any other questions?

Mr. Rhodes: Just to confirm; so, condition three that there shall be no more than five vehicle spaces... just the way that is worded, does that mean there's going to be no more than five vehicles for sale at any one point in time?

Mr. Fields: That's the intent.

Mr. Rhodes: I don't know what classifies as a vehicle display space versus just saying no more than five vehicles for sale at any one time. I'm just curious what is a vehicle display space control?

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Mr. Rhodes, when we do site plan review for automobile sales, we require them to designate vehicle display spaces for the parking of cars to be sold. In addition, we require them to provide parking for the office function of the operation. So this would segregate that there could only be five spaces...

Mr. Howard: So it's one display space equals one vehicle?

Mr. Harvey: Yes.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Mr. Rhodes: Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: But, to clarify, there could be more than five vehicles for sale but only five displayed.

Mr. Harvey: Correct. There could be vehicles in the building or someplace offsite somewhere.

Mr. Howard: That's a good question.

Mrs. Hazard: Mr. Chairman, based on the page 3 of the memorandum, there is a discussion about that the site includes parking display space for ten vehicles for sale because the MVDB, which is the Motor Vehicle Dealer Board currently requires accommodations for ten display vehicles. Is that in conflict with our number three here saying that there are five? Because it says no than five shall be on the site. Is that going to make the applicant not in compliance with this MVDB?

Mr. Howard: I'll tell you, my interpretation when I read this, and Mr. Harvey can correct me or Mrs. Roberts, was they're meeting the requirement of the DMV; however, the County is really acknowledging this as a private individual and there should be no more than five vehicles on display on that property. Mr. Harvey, is that fair? That's how I interpreted this.

Mr. Harvey: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. That would probably be the better wording to say that there will be no more than five vehicles on display at any given time.

Mr. Howard: Which was Mr. Rhodes' point.

Ms. Ansong: I think with this number three it says there shall be no more than five vehicle display spaces on the site or the minimum number required by the Department of Motor Vehicles. And I believe at the time that this was written in 2002, five were allowed; but since then, DMV is now saying that you can have a minimum of ten. So I think that's why we now have ten in terms of what can be displayed.

Ms. Kirkman: So the minimum allowed would be ten?

Mr. Howard: Ten. So he can sell ten, or display ten at a time.

Ms. Ansong: Yes. Because of that condition, yes.

Mr. Howard: Why don't we just change that to ten?

Mr. Fields: I don't think it matters. I don't think he wants to do more than five at a time.

Ms. Ansong: What if the DMV requirements change? So maybe, vehicle display spaces on site, what's allowed, shall be based on the minimum number required by DMV? Something like that perhaps?

Mr. Rhodes: Let the vehicle display spaces be met and just say there will be no more than five vehicles for sale at any point in time.

Ms. Kirkman: Displayed.

Mr. Rhodes: Displayed at any point in time.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Harvey: Yes, that would be my recommendation Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: That's a great one. Who's going to word that?

Ms. Ansong: So, are we going against what DMV, the minimum for DMV, is that what you're...?

Mr. Howard: Nope. We're agreeing with you and you are going to agree with us too.

Ms. Ansong: Okay, sure.

Ms. Kirkman: It's saying yes there will be ten vehicle or the minimum required spaces, however, the property owner will only display up to five at one time.

Mr. Howard: For sale.

Ms. Kirkman: For sale.

Mr. Fields: So, condition number three, we're at page 2 of R10-217, right, is there should be no more than five vehicles displayed for sale on the site.

Mr. Howard: Right.

Mr. Fields: The number of display spaces shall be the minimum number required by the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Mr. Howard: Perfect.

Mr. Rhodes: Seconded.

Mr. Howard: Is that a motion Mr. Fields?

Mr. Fields: Yeah, unless there's any other questions. I think this is one of those things, I know we usually defer, but I think, unless somebody has some major heartburn, I just go ahead and recommend that we recommend approval. So, movement to recommend approval.

Ms. Kirkman: Second.

Mr. Howard: Second by Ms. Kirkman.

Mr. Rhodes: Third.

Mr. Howard: Any discussion? All those in favor of approving CUP as amended, number three amended, CUP1000133, Conditional Use Permit, B & J Auto Sales, signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed say nay. The motion carries 7-0.

Mr. Fields: Thank you.

Ms. Ansong: Thank you.

Mr. Howard: That brings us to the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, amendment to Section 28-163, Review, Section 28-185 and Section 28-203 and 28-254, as well as the Zoning Ordinance O10-31.

9. Amendment to Zoning Ordinance - Amendment to Section 28-163, Review, Section 28-185, Conditional use permits, Section 28-203, Submission and Section 28-254, Plan Changes and Revisions, of the Zoning Ordinance, pursuant to proposed Ordinance O10-31. Minor amendments to approved proffers, approved conditional use permit conditions and minor site plan revisions to approved site plans will be allowed and defined. **(Time Limit: July 20, 2010)**

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, please recognize Andrea Hornung.

Mrs. Hornung: Thank you, Mr. Harvey. Good evening Mr. Chair and members of the Planning Commission. The Ordinance you have before you is one that was sent to you from the Board of Supervisors by Resolution R10-110. And that is a result of a Board of Supervisors' fee subcommittee and the subcommittee of Mr. Crisp and Mr. Milde, they were looking at different items in our fee schedule that could be reduced so that to charge lesser fees. And one of these items would be this Ordinance before you in which it's three sections, three items, in the Zoning Ordinance; one of which is a minor amendment to an approved proffer, a minor amendment to approve conditional use permit conditions and minor revisions to major site plans. And through some research, we have had applications in which the applicant has applied for, as you've just seen in the previous application of an amendment to a previously approved condition. And the result of the fee committee, looking at these items, came about this Ordinance in which the conditions of a minor amendment to those items would be classified as follows: a minor amendment to an approved proffer or a Conditional Use Permit would be classified as no more than two of those Conditional Use Permit conditions or two proffers be amended or changed through an application process, or allowing an extension of time, or anything that would not increase the use, functionality or intensity. The use would be any land use that's defined under Table 3.1 of the Zoning Ordinance for each zoning district. Intensity would also include that being FAR (Floor Area Ratio), open space and density. And then the other item would be a revision to a major site plan and currently we do accept revisions to major site plans; they don't pay the entire fee as a brand new site plan but it is standard for all changes. So, the definition or condition of a minor amendment to an approved major site plan would be something similar but it would be changes that do not affect the intensity, use or functionality of the site that would not substantially affect the layout, meaning you couldn't come in for a minor amendment to a major site plan and flip the project because there would be a lot of issues involved and it could be a substantial change. Also, the change of the use would not require an increase in parking. Because of our tabulations and the requirements in the

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

zoning districts of the Ordinance, there are different parking requirements for different uses. So, by the Ordinance O10-31, the Section 28-163 would be the section that would add (b) and that would be the minor amendments to the approved proffers. And those four items that are added to that Zoning Ordinance section would be that in an approved conditional zoning, based on the approved proffers by the owner of the property, minor amendments to the approved proffer shall be allowed subject to the following requirements: and these are detailed as no more than two proffered conditions can be changed at the time of a request; changes do not materially affect site layout; and changes do not affect intensity, use or functionality of the site; and the applications pursuant to this paragraph may be exempt from the requirements of Section 28-203(e), and that's the one that specifies the application for proffers, rezonings. C, the other section of this, would be that major amendments to approved proffers... any amendment to approved proffer conditions, other than that defined in the section I just read to you, they would be major and would have to go through the same process as a brand new proffer amendment. Now, the land use cases that are already approved through the public hearing process of the Conditional Use Permits and the proffers, the minor amendments would follow that same process. The Conditional Use Permit Section 28-185 is basically the same. It's saying that any approved Conditional Use Permit pursuant to this article may be revised by the Board of Supervisors after notice and hearing pursuant the Section 15.2-2204 of the Code. And that no more than two permit conditions can be changed at the time of request; changes do not materially affect the site layout; and the changes do not affect intensity, use or functionality. And also a major amendment to a Conditional Use Permit would be those that are not defined by the previous section that I stated. And they would follow the regular process. In 28-254, that's plan changes and revisions which is the section of the site plan submission, (c) is added and that paragraph is that minor changes to approved major site development plans would be any major site development plan that would be a minor revision is accomplished in the same manner as originally approved and subject to the following requirements: changes do not materially affect the site layout, intensity, use or functionality, and then the can also correct non-engineering errors. And this Ordinance is ready for your consideration.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mrs. Hornung. Are there any questions from the Planning Commission? No? I'll open it up for public comments and I should have done that actually with the CUP for the B & J Auto Sales, so what we'll do is let you comment on both if you'd like to do that. So, anyone wishing to comment on the Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance may do so by stepping forward to the podium. We just need to know your name and where you live. And, again, you have three minutes to address the Planning Commission. We will not answer you back. We will, in general terms, if there are questions we can answer tonight, but not directly. So, if you want to step up to the podium, you may do so. When the green light goes on you have three minutes to begin, the yellow light will tell you there's about a minute left and when the red light goes on we would ask that you conclude your comments. Anyone wishing to address us on either public hearing number 8 or 9 may do so by stepping forward now. Seeing no one advancing, I will close the public hearing portion on that and bring it back to the Planning Commission. Are there any questions of staff from the Commissioners? No? Okay. Would anyone like to make a motion? The Chairman generally does not make motions, though I would like to. Mrs. Roberts, there was a time when we were doing Zoning Ordinances or recommending proposed changes we read something that seemed to be a little more formal than we've done the last couple of months here. Are we missing something?

Mrs. Roberts: No, I believe it's part of the Ordinance, the Whereas for public welfare. As long as it's in there, the motion that you're adopting is fine. If you would like to read it, that's fine too, but as long as it in the Ordinance you're adopting, that covers it.

Mr. Howard: Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion for the adoption of Ordinance of O10-31 and the Resolution before it which would be Resolution R10-110. Motion for adoption for both items.

Mr. Howard: So, we're just focused on Ordinance O10-31, is that right? Okay. You were correct Mr. Mitchell. Is there a second?

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, whereas that public necessity, convenience, general welfare and good zoning practices require adoption of such an ordinance, I will second it.

Mr. Howard: Great!

Mr. Rhodes: I wanted to get it in there for the record.

Mr. Howard: We have a motion that's been seconded; is there any discussion?

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to oppose the motion to recommend approval. In previous discussion when we went over this Ordinance, I have two concerns from those discussions. The first is that the reduced fees do not cover the costs of staff time for public hearings which will still be required which creates a negative deficit or could certainly create the potential for a negative deficit of revenues for the Planning Department which is supposed to be self-supporting through fees. My second concern regarding this Ordinance is that when staff went over what might potentially be a minor revision, there seemed to be a lot of room for interpretation. So, I'm simply not comfortable with this going forward.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Any other comments?

Mr. Hiron: Mr. Chairman, I'm actually joining Ms. Kirkman and not so much for the second reason, but because of the first reason. These fees I don't think were adequately answered as to covering the actual staff costs. I think that's an issue we need to deal with within this County.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Any other comments? Okay, my comments just are I thought actually staff did a pretty good job last time we asked those questions. And, while I would agree there wasn't a scientific mathematical answer to the question. I'm not sure that we can actually have one. I think the spirit under which the Board is attempting to do this makes sense in terms of the economic times that we find ourselves in and we can say "boy, does that make sense that the County would take less fees" while actually the goal would be to increase the activity on these types of CUPs and other changes and amendments. So, I think that's the spirit under which this was created and I would argue that we can always change it back to the way it was should that not be the case. So, I'm going to support this. Any other comments? Hearing none, I'll call for the vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed?

Mr. Fields: No.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: Nay.

Mr. Hirons: No.

Mr. Howard: I think that was 4-3, am I correct? Okay, the vote carries 4 to 3. Thank you very much. Okay, and that brings us to item 2 on the agenda. Before we start that, I'll ask the group... why don't we just take a quick three minute break and then we'll come back and get right into the Comprehensive Plan. So, we'll take a quick recess and be back in three minutes.

2. Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan (**Time Limit: September 7, 2010**) (**In Comp Plan Committee**) (**Deferred to July 7, 2010**)

The meeting reconvened at 8:18 p.m.

Mr. Howard: Thank you. Welcome back. We will now reconvene the Stafford County Planning Commission meeting of July 7, 2010. And we're on item 2 which is under Unfinished Business on the agenda. And we'll now here from Mr. Zuraf on the draft version of the Comprehensive Plan with changes highlighted.

Mr. Zuraf: Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Planning Commission. I'm here to provide a summary of the latest draft Plan. You should have received... and if I can have the floor computer please... you should have received two copies of the Plan, one version with all final changes and then another version with changes highlighted. If you don't have them, we have some copies. We're going to have additional staff assisting with this presentation as we go through and just wanted to go over generally the introduction to comprehensive planning, the history of this whole process, some overviews of the plan and then getting into some of the details. This Plan is a product of more than four years of work and time that has been spent by current and previous Planning Commission, Board members, other County Commission members, citizens and staff. The first thing I want to cover is going into the introduction of comprehensive planning, more of a background and first looking at why. Why do we prepare a Comprehensive Plan? The Comprehensive Plan serves to kind of articulate the County's preferred future physical development. It tells citizens where you want to be and how to get there, in relation to intensity of development, the types of growth that you want, and where you want to maybe preserve land. Also, we do it because it is mandated by State Code. Section 2223 of the State Code lists out the general basic requirements that should be in a Comprehensive Plan and also identifies what some other optional things that can be in Comprehensive Plans. And Section 2223.1 gets into more detailed requirements regarding Urban Development Areas. Some of the basic features of the Plan; the plan should be general in nature. It serves to represent the desires of the community and would typically cover a twenty year planning horizon. Plan elements that you often see in a Comprehensive Plan cover issues relating to land use, transportation, the environment, public facilities and other issues. The implementation of a plan, that's often the next step in the process and it's often necessary to achieve a successful plan. And plan implementation occurs through adopting various ordinances to localities; Zoning Ordinance, Subdivision Ordinances that help to get to the legal requirements as it relates to land development. Also, that's implemented through a Capital Improvements Program which identifies future public facility needs to help meet the needs of the community and then it's implemented through evaluation of development proposals against the Comprehensive Plan. In looking at the history of this process, or pretty much five years on one slide, the process began back in 2005 when a new direction for the development of the County was envisioned. Basically then the process was begun. In the spring of 2006 the County hired on a consultant and organized a steering committee of fourteen members of various Commissions and the

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Board and Planning Commission and worked to develop and present a draft Plan to the Planning Commission in 2007. The Planning Commission evaluated the Plan through 2007. In 2008, a Comp Plan Subcommittee was organized and worked on making amendments to the draft Plan that was presented. And later on in 2008, I think that was in October of 2008, the first Planning Commission public hearing was held and eventually in December of that year the Plan was forwarded on to the Board of Supervisors. Then in 2009 the Board conducted several work sessions, made additional adjustments to the Plan and in October of 2009 held a joint public hearing. And at that point the Plan was tabled and sent back to the Planning Commission. That brings us to this year where another Comp Plan Subcommittee was formed and additional amendments occurred and was completed this past June. This proposal is generally going to focus on the latest draft of the Plan. And, just as a reminder, when the hearing occurred back in October of 2009, it not only included the adoption of a new Comprehensive Plan, at the same time the request was also to repeal the current Land Use Plan since this new Comp Plan would include land use proposals that would replace the prior Comp Plan. Now, getting to the overall philosophy of this latest draft of the Plan or the general overview, this Plan recommends a more generalized future land use that more so reflects form, density and intensity of development, as opposed to narrowing down on the types of uses that could occur from place to place. It encourages infill development and redevelopment in established suburban areas. It recommends less growth in agricultural and rural areas through means such as Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights. And a lot of this work and getting to the details of how Transfer of Development Rights will actually work and be applied here is going to be a follow-up effort. The Board of Supervisors has kind of requested the Planning Commission to work on kind of what those details will be and how the Transfer of Development Rights will work in the County. The Plan includes growth projections that are derived from mandated state population projections through the Virginia Employment Commission. The Plan generally identifies where projected growth is desired. It identifies the cost of growth and facility needs that would be resulting from the projected growth and recognizes potential conflicts with military activities that might occur due to the ammunition ranges and aircraft overflight related to activities on Quantico. And also it identifies, in the Land Use section, identifies some program transportation improvements and recommends some new road networks. At this point, I'll hand it over to Kathy to talk some about the goals, objectives and policies. That is Chapter 2 of the Plan. Chapter 1 of the Plan is more of the intro, it discusses and summarizes the State Code requirements and provides some of the history of the Plan. But, at this point, I'll hand it over to Kathy to talk about the goals.

Mrs. Baker: Thank you. Moving right into the goals, objectives and policies, these will provide the framework for physical development of the County. You can see there the nine main topics that I'm going to discuss here. The first goal is managing growth and development in a sustainable manner. There are several objectives here which I will discuss a few of those but not all of the ones that are going to be mentioned here. Directing growth into the Urban Services Area, and this could occur by limiting infrastructure outside the Urban Service Area or the USA. There would be several criteria that would need to be met in order to expand the USA in the future. Another objective is to promote infill and redevelopment where infrastructure is already in place. And this does focus infill in the four proposed redevelopment areas, the Boswell's Corner, Courthouse, Southern Gateway and Falmouth. Third would be preserving rural and agricultural areas and this would be through means such as Mike mentioned, the Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights, which we do currently have a program for PDR. The fourth would be phasing growth to coincide with infrastructure and also integrate land use and transportation decisions by prioritizing improvements within the USA. The next goal is to ensure that growth and development is managed in a fiscally responsible manner, and some of the objectives here include developing a Land Use Plan that accommodates twenty years of growth without encouraging additional growth. Also, develop level of

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

service standards and a public facilities plan to identify when and where public facilities would be needed throughout the County. Another objective would be ensuring development pays its share of the costs of growth, and this would be through proffers and the collection of impact fees. The next goal deals with encouraging protection of the natural environment, and some of these objectives include improving air quality and these policies would focus on establishment of land use patterns that reduce vehicle trips and strategies which may improve traffic flow. Also, preventing and reducing surface and groundwater pollution; there are several policies such as best management practices for minimization of clearing and grading and encouragement of watershed management planning. Another objective is protecting the waterways from land use activities. There are recommendations for evaluating the need to strengthen some of the County's Chesapeake Bay Ordinance requirements. Another objective is conserving and restoring tree cover and this may occur through establishment of tree cover requirements and also encouraging preservation of existing vegetation instead of replanting. The next goal ensures health, safety and welfare of the County citizens. Some of the objectives include protecting the drinking water sources, our existing and future resource reservoirs, also minimizing development on unstable soils. This could occur through clustering development away from steep slopes and other land that may be unsuitable for development. Minimizing flood hazard impacts and this would occur by discouraging development in our dam break inundation zones which we are currently working on. Also minimize impacts generated, as Mike said, by Quantico, incorporating noise and range safety zones into an overlay district and then following their Land Use Compatibility guidelines. The next goal is promoting affordable and quality housing. And these objectives include identifying the need for and solutions to create affordable housing. And this would best be accomplished through establishment of an affordable housing taskforce. Also, to increase the stock of affordable housing and this could occur by creating incentives for private development for the creation of affordable housing. And third is promoting housing opportunities for all income and age ranges by allowing for a mix of housing choices and including universal design features in housing. The next goal is with regards to transportation; prioritizing safety improvements basically over capacity improvements in order to maintain a safe road system. Also, provide and maintain alternate modes of transportation. Create better patterns of traffic flow and circulation by providing multiple access points and inner connectivity through developments. And maintain and enhance the visual landscape along major transportation corridors while retaining functionality of the roads. The next goal is to support the economic vitality of the County and some of the objects include establishing targets for commercial and business growth, perhaps relaxing maximum floor area ratio standards in the redevelopment and Urban Development Areas and establishing land use policies which would attract and retain high quality employment such as furthering the establishment of the technology zones. The next goal is to support higher quality education and this Land Use Policy should consider appropriate location and site standards. And this may include locating the schools adjacent to your neighborhoods as opposed to along the busy corridors, along transmission lines or other hazardous areas. Goal 9 is promoting the protection of the County's heritage resources. We would need to identify and protect and interpret the cultural resources that we do have. And some of the objectives are updating the management plans and follow-up ordinances as recommended in those plans, and establishing a stewardship program that would care for the County-owned historic and cultural properties. With that, I am going to turn the microphone back to Mike to go over Chapter 3 and the Land Use Plan.

Mr. Zuraf: Okay, looking more at Chapter 3, going over some of the key features of the Land Use Plan, the Land Use Plan addresses growth management through the use of an Urban Services Area which is one of the main methods that the County has utilized over the years to manage the location of growth. The Urban Service Area is generally an area where higher density development would be allowed. Higher density development is that which would usually require public water and sewer utilities and you would also have many of your needed public facilities located within your designated

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Urban Service Area. The Urban Service Area boundary generally promotes infill development. The location of the Urban Service Area does not extend too much further out from the current Urban Service Area location with the exception of some of the areas that are identified for some of the new Urban Development areas which we'll get into. Some of the other features of this plan, the plan does identify some new limited water and sewer service areas and I'll get into that as well and where those are. Also, it highlights the four redevelopment areas that the County has been working on over the last few years, in Boswell's Corner, the Courthouse area, Southern Gateway and Falmouth. And those are highlighted on the map. The plan then also does recognize the military activities in Quantico as we've gone over and addresses that. These images identify the proposed limited water and sewer service areas which are identified in areas where there are documented problems, where problems may exist. This map on the left is the recommended Rock Hill Sewer Service Area, the two areas identified in green. And then the map on the right is the Hartwood Water Service Area which is basically in the vicinity of Hartwood Elementary School near the intersection of Hartwood Road and Warrenton Road. This next image is included in the Land Use section which identifies the recommended limits of the noise impact and range compatibility zones relating to activities in Quantico. The circular bands are the noise zones that go into the County and then the hatched-in area are the range safety zones that are more related to aircraft overflight that generally covers parts of North Stafford and into Hartwood. The Land Use Map itself gets generalized into four main categories; you have the Urban Development Areas, Suburban Areas, Business and Industry Areas, and Rural and Agriculture. The Urban Development Areas include nine urban areas designated. These go along with the Urban Development Areas that are recommended under 2223.1 of the State Code. There are about three types of Urban Development Areas being recommended. Three of the Urban Development Areas are located over three of the redevelopment areas including Boswell's Corner, Courthouse and Southern Gateway. Then another three Urban Development Areas are located mainly along the main transportation and road networks through the County, in the center of the County and the first one is the George Washington Urban Development Area south of Courthouse Road, west of Interstate 95. Then you have the Centerport Urban Development Area near the Centerport Interchange and also the Eskimo Hill Urban Area. Then the third type of Urban Area is Urban Areas located along transit, along the rail line at Leeland Station, Brooke and at Stafford Station which is in the Widewater Peninsula area. These areas are designed to, in plan, to accommodate ten years of projected growth in the County and we'll get to some more of what those numbers are in a moment. The Suburban Areas on the Plan are identified as two main areas and designates two main areas. They're designated over more of the established and developing suburban areas in North Stafford and in South Stafford around Fredericksburg. And these areas would encourage more of the continuation of a suburban form of development. In these areas also the map identifies some of the main commercial corridors and commercial nodes where more commercial oriented development has occurred or may occur in the future. The Business and Industry District, those surround seven areas where you mainly have established or developing industrial parks or areas such as like the Cool Spring Road corridor is one of the areas that we discussed earlier. And then Centerport is another Business and Industry area and around the airport. Also then the Rural and Agricultural Area are areas outside of the Urban Service Area. These areas recommend the continuation of farming and forestry and three acre lot sizes in residential neighborhoods. This is the Land Use Plan Map that we have and you can see the yellow areas identify the Suburban Districts. You see the primary location in North Stafford and the Suburban District in South Stafford. The lighter green identifies the rural areas. I will zoom in to better identify some of the Business and Industry Areas. You have one around the airport and there are more in South Stafford. But then looking at the northern part of the County, the Urban Areas are identified with the green-yellow hatching around; this is the Courthouse Urban Area, Boswell's Corner along Route 1, the Widewater Urban Area along the Potomac River. You have then the George Washington Urban Area, your Courthouse Road and Ramoth Church Road. Looking at the southern part of the County, you see

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

the southern Suburban Area. Also then you can see the Brooke Urban Area along the rail line, the Leeland Urban Area and the Centerport Urban Area and Southern Gateway. You do have in gray some of the other industrial areas along 17 and the Cool Spring Road Industrial Corridor. The Plan, as I mentioned earlier, includes future growth projections. The projections are based on twenty years worth of growth and that would cause for through the State Virginia Employment Commission, 28,501 new future dwelling units. And in the Plan, the Plan generally recommends that at least, as one of the policies, that at least eighty percent of the future residential growth would be recommended in the Urban Service Area. Half of that eighty percent would occur in the Urban Development Areas, recommended to occur in the Urban Development Areas; that equates to 14,922 dwelling units. It ends up being a little more than fifty percent after you run all the numbers. And then the remaining thirty percent in the Suburban Areas would account for 8,550 dwelling units over the next twenty years. Then the remaining twenty percent of growth is recommended in the Rural Areas or 5,700 dwelling units. Commercial growth is projected at being approximately one million square feet per year or twenty million over a twenty year period. This is base on some past committee meetings that occurred earlier on in the process where there was some discussion on more of the economic development issues and the Economic Development Department had data that back in the '90's some of the commercial growth occurred at about a million square feet per year. We may not be there right now but the committee felt that that would be a good number to shoot for as we move into the future. As mentioned also, the Plan does address transportation needs where it didn't do that before. It highlights some of the approved road improvement projects that have occurred through programs such as the 2008 Transportation Bond, the Transportation Impact Fee Program and the VDOT Six Year Improvement Program. It also identifies some new road segments that may help facilitate traffic circulation through some of the redevelopment areas and then Urban Development Areas. And then the Plan does identify the potential for two future rail stations in Widewater in the Stafford Station Urban Area and then in the Chatham Heights area. And at this point I'll hand it over to Joey to talk about the costs of growth.

Mr. Hess: Thank you Mike. Okay, Chapter 4, Public Costs of Growth. I'll start it by identifying the purpose of public costs of growth. The first is to ensure the level of public service is provided in a fiscally responsible manner and that adequate public facilities are available to support development and its impacts. How we accomplish this is by identifying desirable levels of service. Two examples that we show you here are providing twenty acres of parkland, active and passive, per thousand acres and another example would be one square foot of library floor area per capita. We also looked at other levels of service, other public facilities, and talked about how we would continue to provide the existing service levels such as government facilities and fire and rescue facilities, what like the square footage is as an example for that. In doing this methodology, we identified what the overall associated costs of public facilities were on a public residential unit and this just happened to be the example of the estimated cost for a single-family dwelling unit, which was just a little bit under \$77,000. And then, of course, we talk about what the identification of actions to mitigate the public facility cost would be and that would be through the collection of proffers, either through cash proffers or through donations such as land or an actual facility. And these would help offset these impacts and mitigate the development's impact on public facilities. Then we talked about, continuing this on Chapter 4, we talked about how this is accomplished. Well, we looked at projections for future public needs and this was based off our public facilities plan which is Section B in the Appendix; you see all the different charts and actually Appendix A shows you the methodology which we used for the associated public facility costs which I showed you on the previous slide. When you take what the population projection is going to be, which is the Virginia Employment Commission population projection from 2010 to 2030 and you take various other mathematical elements and you add it all up, you look at again what your desirable level of service is or what you're providing as far as a service level today. Per each type

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

of public facility you come up with the need for five elementary schools, three middle schools... excuse me, two middle schools and three high schools over the course of the next twenty years. And then there's a need for the five fire and rescue facilities, a little less than 1,900 square feet of parkland, again active and/or passive, three libraries and approximately 147,000 square feet of general government space. And then there's supposed to be development of the impact model to evaluate the growth and how growth might affect government finances. And again, that was in the Comprehensive Plan and that was speaking to at a later date adopting a financial impact model to help assess that. Moving on to Chapter 5, the existing conditions of Stafford County. This chapter provides characteristics of the community such as housing, the economy, historical and cultural resources and so forth. It also contains several detailed maps. Some of the maps would be like population density or location of community facilities. It also does population projects, both inside and outside the Urban Service Area. And then it's a source for existing facility data such as schools and parks and other public infrastructure. Again, inventory lists of what the County currently has or is providing to any of its public facilities. And with that I'll turn it back to Mike.

Mr. Zuraf: I'm getting my exercise today, standing up and down. Looking at the timeline and future tasks, where we are now the Planning Commission has the work session today, there's another work session scheduled on July 21st and then you have another meeting on August 18th when you might be able to talk more about the Comp Plan. The Board of Supervisors, as you might be aware, they had a work session yesterday. They've scheduled another work session to consider the Plan on July 28th, a new meeting date. And then also they will have another meeting on August 17th. The Board of Supervisors has expressed a desire to possibly try to have a potential joint public hearing sometime in September. But whenever the joint public occurs and the Plan gets approved, then you have follow-up steps that will have to occur through the implementation that's discussed in Chapter 2. The County staff would work to establish some more specific actions that will help to ensure that the goals, objectives and policies are achieved or followed. This would occur within ninety days of approval of the document. And following that, that will likely lead to follow-up revisions of other Plan elements that are described in Chapter 1 and part of the overall Comprehensive Plan, and at that point we will try to answer any questions as best we can.

Mr. Howard: Thank you very much. I'll bring it back to the Planning Commission and see if there are questions.

Ms. Kirkman: Mr. Chair, could we go back to the slide on the schedule? I think it makes sense to maybe start with some of the process questions. At what point does the Planning Commission have to approve a motion to send this to public hearing because of the notice requirements, advertising and notice requirements?

Mr. Zuraf: It would... the last chance would have to be the August 18th meeting, if a joint public meeting was desired on September 7th.

Ms. Kirkman: August 18th is sufficient for September 7th?

Mr. Zuraf: Barely. We would have to have the ad ready to go and there would have to be minimal changes to the Plan at that time. So, that would be the bare minimum but it could possibly work.

Mr. Howard: Any other questions? No? Okay. Alright, were there any additional questions for staff on... I know it was kind of a high level... we also do have obviously a second meeting scheduled for the 21st to go through this in greater detail. But certainly we have all night.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Fields: I mean, are we going into detail about... you know, page by page? Or are you talking about questions just on the high level presentation?

Mr. Howard: I think questions on the high level. If they're specific page by page, we did reserve the entire next meeting in July for this.

Mr. Fields: Okay.

Mr. Howard: There's nothing else on the agenda. But by all means, if there are other things you are things you are thinking about or would like...

Mr. Fields: Well, no, I don't want to launch into like asking small detailed questions if that's not what we're doing tonight. I certainly have plenty of them, but if we're reserving the whole next meeting in July, right, if we're going page by page.

Mr. Howard: Yeah, it will be for the entire Comprehensive Plan review. I do appreciate the fact that staff was able to get this out to us earlier. I know you were shooting for a date and you actually... I think it was about six or seven days earlier than we had thought, so thank you for doing that.

Mr. Zuraf: Well, and I guess in advance of the next meeting, if the Commission has any specific things that you want us to go over, that might be good hear sooner than later and we can prepare...

Mr. Howard: I have a couple that I was going to ask for but I wanted to see if there were any other comments.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, mine would be for next time. We've had a couple on again, off again, road projects, one being the Berea Parkway, the one coming over from the airport area... or, no, I'm sorry, wherever that ties in on the east... down to Route 17. So I'd just like to discuss whatever surrounded placing that back on there. The other one is the, I can't remember the name of it, I think it's like Widewater Parkway or that element. So, those two road things; I know starting when Steve Pitzel, myself and Arch Di Peppe failed to get this accomplished and then rolling along to the near completion under Arch with a different team supporting him, I think it was Pete and Cecelia, and now this team actually getting it closer, that's been back and forth many times. So, I'd just like to understand some more behind how those evolved on there because I've missed that along the way a little bit. And I know this has been there a little bit but the one UDA on the Widewater area will be one I will want to discuss some more because that just kind of stands out there; you know, a fairly undeveloped area. But those are my three main things after having reviewed. Anybody could go through a lot of little things, but those are my three major things that I will want to talk about next time. So, thanks Mike.

Mr. Fields: Mr. Rhodes and I have been on the Transportation Commission along with Mrs. Hazard, as we prepare for that, I would remind that the last time that the Transportation Commission looked at the Transportation Plan we had removed the Berea Parkway and the Widewater Rail Station. So, that had been the current thinking on the Transportation Committee up until this current revision.

Mr. Howard: Okay.

Mr. Fields: We probably need to go through how the Transportation Committee got to the reasoning of removing the Berea Parkway and the Widewater Rail Station and then how we got to placing them

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

back onto the Comprehensive Plan. I have many questions but I'm interested to understand how those things diverged there.

Ms. Kirkman: Yeah, some numbers that would be helpful for me for our next meeting; of the 7, 265 acres that are in the Urban Development Areas, how much of that acreage is currently impervious surface and how much of it is greenfields? I think a map showing the current Urban Service Area boundaries versus the proposed under this draft would be helpful.

Mr. Howard: I was going to ask for that as well. If you could do an overlay, almost like we had with one of the applicants today that actually was pretty good. I don't know how you could do that but if there's a way to print something similar where we could just sort of put one over the other so there's some transparency in terms of us being able to view that visually. Would that be helpful?

Ms. Kirkman: Yeah, they did it... in the last draft we did it. And since the Board has hired a consultant to compare this draft with the 2009 draft, I'd also like to see the Urban Services Area boundary from this draft compared to the 2009 draft.

Mr. Zuraf: So, two comparisons; one to the existing current and then the last 2009. Okay.

Ms. Kirkman: And the one that was considered in September, yeah. That'd be great, thanks.

Mr. Howard: I would also add the difference between the existing and the 2009 Plan also, so you have... that's what you asked for? So this is a valid comparison to both. And, was there anything else Ms. Kirkman?

Ms. Kirkman: And, along those same lines, because I looked for it and we had calculated the build-outs very differently in the previous Plan that was done this time. If we could get what the acreage was inside and outside the Urban Services Area under the 2009 draft. I know you have that because I know we used that as the base for a lot of the calculations. Thanks.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman and Ms. Kirkman, for clarity sake from the staff perspective, I guess we have a draft that the Planning Commission recommended in 2008 and then the 2009 joint public hearing draft. They are different and looking at the Resolution the Board passed for the comparison, it looks at the December '08 plan. Is that what you were referring to on the comparison of the USA boundaries?

Ms. Kirkman: No, I was thinking more what we did the joint public hearing on last September.

Mr. Harvey: Okay.

Mr. Howard: Yeah, my only comment, that's fine; I would just like sort of the apples to apples. So, if we're comparing the existing to that, we should also compare this proposed one to that one as well. I think that's what Ms. Kirkman is asking anyway, so it sounds like there's at least three comparisons, right? So we would want to compare what this version, this current draft, compared to our actual Land Use Map today, then the current draft compared to the 2009 post public hearing draft, and then the existing Land Use compared to the current draft as well. Does that make sense? Or did I say the first one twice?

Ms. Kirkman: You said the first one twice.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Zuraf: The latest draft compared to first the current plan and then the 2009 plan.

Mr. Howard: But then we should compare this draft... we want the current plan compared to both this draft and the 2009 draft, okay, then we want this plan compared to the 2009 plan. Does that make sense? I am asking for three separate overlays.

Mr. Zuraf: That's the same thing.

Mr. Howard: I don't know that to be the case though so... our current Land Use Map that we use today?

Mr. Fields: You want to see the existing service area boundaries, right?

Mr. Howard: Right.

Mr. Fields: And then you want to see what was proposed in the 2009...

Mr. Zuraf: Oh, so basically all three versions, three different comparisons.

Mr. Howard: Yeah. If it ends up being the same, that's fine.

Mr. Fields: The ability to compare those three.

Mr. Howard: But I don't know that that's the same, that's why I'm asking.

Mr. Zuraf: The current existing plan to the... I gotcha.

Mr. Howard: Got it? Okay. Mike says he has it.

Mr. Zuraf: I hope.

Mr. Howard: Alright. I'm a believer. And then, Ms. Kirkman, was there anything else?

Ms. Kirkman: Not at this moment.

Mr. Howard: You may think of something else. In some of the financial data that is in the document, there are a lot of changes. So, I guess, Mr. Hess, that's your area of expertise as I understand? So I would just... I'm not going to give you specifics now, but I would just ask that you come, you know, prepared; you usually do but just come prepared because we want to understand the changes in the numbers and then some of the changes in the calculation, whether it's the parkland per capita or it's the housing unit size and so on and so forth. I'm sure there will be questions like that; I know I have a few. But again, I don't want to get into all the details. I would think there will be others as well.

Mr. Zuraf: We may not have the data on impervious surface versus green area.

Ms. Kirkman: But you do because you were able to calculate that. Remember, we had requested that for the redevelopment areas and you did come up with a method for doing that. So I know you have a way of doing it.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Zuraf: Was it just an estimation or...

Ms. Kirkman: I'll try and find the file but this was not that long ago and it was done through the mapping software and maybe you did something like... I don't know right off the bat what methodology you used, but you did do it through the mapping software. And it was this year that you did it. It was when we were discussing the redevelopment areas.

Mr. Harvey: Yes, it was spring if I recall.

Ms. Kirkman: Yeah. So, you've developed the methodology somewhere.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah. This request was in the UDA's.

Ms. Kirkman: For the UDA's, that's correct. And then, Mike, on all of your tables, it's just not clear to me what your methodology... it's not even written out in the draft what the methodology is for calculating the projected growth for each of the types of areas. If you have a spreadsheet that shows that or just like what you calculated on a per acre basis or how you did that, that would be helpful to see.

Mr. Howard: Did the methodology change on that from the prior version?

Mr. Zuraf: Yes. The prior version was more of a countywide full build-out and this is more of a projection of taking the projected twenty year growth and placing that within the map.

Mr. Howard: In the specific UDA's.

Mr. Zuraf: So those numbers don't reflect full build-out.

Mr. Howard: Right.

Ms. Kirkman: You had to come up with the numbers somehow and that's what I want to see, is the somehow how you came up with them.

Mr. Howard: Okay. Any other questions or comments before staff concludes?

Mr. Harvey: Well, Mr. Chairman, we do have available the capacity to run through the Land Use Map if there are any specific questions. Mrs. Bullington is here; we can have her at the next meeting to do that as well. She certainly will be available at the next meeting also to bring up the comparison maps on the computer.

Mr. Howard: Yeah, I think what people want to see is if there's a way to... if she wants to do that now, high level, what are some of the differences, that might not be a bad idea.

Mrs. Bullington: (Inaudible).

Mr. Howard: So, for those of you listening at home, for the next meeting she will have the GIS available and we will show those screen shots on the TV so you can follow along with us. Thank you.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Fields: Also, Mr. Howard, one question. Back to the transportation issue... I haven't seen any data; does the County have the capacity or before the public hearing do they plan to even try a run of our transportation model then taking into account the UDA's and all of the changes? I mean, is there anybody left in the County that even knows how to run the model? I mean, I know you do because you know how to do all that stuff. But you're too busy to do that.

Mr. Harvey: I'll have to check with the Public Works Department and our current contract and how it's set up as far as being able to do another model run; whether that's doable within the timeframe prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Fields: I'm just... my concern, back to transportation, is with several multiple runs in that model and all the looks that we took in the Transportation Committee, we were getting a pretty good handle on existing and future demand on the road network of the County. But that was existing and perhaps some of the proposed in the draft land use things, and this has some fairly radical changes to both of those. And so the transportation model data now that we have evolved to get to that point would probably be relatively overtaken by events, as they say. My concern is that we had a pretty good handle, I think, on evaluating existing and future demands and now, before we approve large changes to the Land Use landscape, if we don't have that same handle, I would point that out as an area of concern. So, maybe you could just tell us if it's been done... I know it hasn't been done... if it could be done or if that's just out of the question.

Mr. Harvey: Will do.

Mr. Fields: Thank you.

Ms. Kirkman: So, just to clarify, there's not been to date any modeling done of the new draft?

Mr. Harvey: Correct. There's been no transportation modeling.

Ms. Kirkman: Okay.

Mr. Howard: All that was done on the transportation was the Bond Referendum items added into it in terms of the projected improvements or desired improvements, which again is based on a lot of work that's been done in the past.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman? I would just like to ask staff that now, Mike, as you look at the collective list that you just wrote down there, does that all seem doable given schedules and other demands for two weeks from now?

Mr. Zuraf: Well, I think what likely will have to happen is this information will be brought to the meeting, given schedules and vacations.

Mr. Harvey: We will try to provide as much as we can. There may be some that has to come to the meeting. Some of the presentations will certainly have to take place while we're in the meeting so it can be better understood, but we'll try to gather as much data. Plus we'll recapture all the questions and bring them back.

Mr. Zuraf: Yeah.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Ms. Kirkman: And, Mr. Chair, the draft proposed some fairly radical changes to water and sewer. Can we have somebody from the Utilities Department here to answer questions regarding that?

Mr. Howard: Sure.

Mr. Zuraf: We will see who can attend.

Ms. Kirkman: This is the only item for our next meeting?

Mr. Howard: That's it.

Ms. Kirkman: Great.

Mr. Harvey: Mr. Chairman, certainly the staff would entertain any comments the Commissioners may have as far as observations where there may be some questions of the text that may not be clear or you may not understand, something that's a red flag. Maybe we can look at the wording, or if there are any typos or anything that came out as obvious, we would greatly appreciate that in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Howard: Good. So, they can just send that via email to you?

Mr. Harvey: Yes, that would be great.

Mr. Howard: Okay, good. Thank you. I guess that will conclude item 2 on the agenda this evening, and then we'll move into the... thank you very much... into the Planning Director's Report.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Harvey: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Roberts has left from the dais and I wanted to thank her and acknowledge all her hard work that she's provided for the Planning and Zoning staff over the years. She's provided us with assistance with the Planning Commission and a number of other Commissions and Boards that we staff throughout her tenure with the County, and it's been greatly appreciated and she's done it in a very professional manner. And I'd like to thank her for that.

Mr. Howard: Yeah, I couldn't agree with you more Mr. Harvey. I was going to bring that up and I will, so I'll wait. Go ahead.

Mr. Harvey: And then, also, for the Commission's information regarding yesterday's Board of Supervisors actions, they approved the Conditional Use Permit for the White Oak Car Wash. After the public hearing, there were some citizen comments about concerns with the access as it was proposed at the Planning Commission level being located off of Southside Drive. The applicant met with Mr. Crisp and they changed the General Development Plan to move the entrance further to the east and that was incorporated into the conditions of the use permit that was ultimately approved.

Ms. Kirkman: Did VDOT look at that change? I was just curious because, as I recall, a lot of work went into... is that right Mr. Fields? Wasn't that yours?

Mr. Fields: Yeah, that was. That's interesting. Well, it'll be interesting to see what change they proposed. The one I proposed seemed to be the only workable solution at the time. But, you know, if

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

you keep looking at something long enough, maybe you can come up with something different. It's out of my hands.

Mr. Harvey: Ultimately, once we have detailed engineering, that will answer the question.

Mr. Howard: Right, whether it's feasible or not, sure.

Mr. Harvey: And that concludes my report.

Mr. Howard: Was there anything on the Subcommittee getting together one more time? Did I miss that?

Mr. Harvey: There was mention of that yesterday. In the Board's discussion on the Comp Plan, there were a number of questions regarding the cost of growth in that chapter. And there was a suggestion made that maybe the joint Board/Planning Commission Comp Plan Committee would meet possibly sometime next week.

Mr. Howard: Did they have a date?

Mr. Harvey: As of today, I have not heard of any specific date.

Mr. Howard: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Harvey: You're welcome.

COUNTY ATTORNEY'S REPORT

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Mr. Howard: I'm assuming the Committee Reports we just sort of went through.

Mrs. Hazard: We did. All I would say is I would certainly want to thank staff for their helping assistance on everything and their professional manner. I know we spent a lot of Thursday nights together and I just would like to thank them for their dedication to the project and for all the input. And I certainly hope that the public and others will give the input to us and to send as much the earlier the better. As Jeff said, the more we can get into the comments now and ahead of time so we can improve the plan in the places that it needs to be improved and discuss those areas that we need to discuss and flush out.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mrs. Hazard. I agree; staff has really been through quite a lot, and not just this year either. So I want to acknowledge and recognize that. It's been quite a bit and I appreciate their patience and their resilience, and the former Commissioners that are not here, which would be Mrs. Carlone and Mr. Di Peppe, did an awful lot of work on this as well. And they are to be acknowledged and they put a lot of commitment into this and that entire Committee, along with Ms. Kirkman. I know there's a lot to discuss and there's a lot of things people want to get out there in their comments and we'll let all that happen at the next meeting. And I do appreciate everyone's professionalism and I just would encourage us to continue down that road, but I recognize that we will not always agree on everything and that's a good thing in the long run. So, in terms of the Chairman's Report, I want to...

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Fields: Mr. Chairman, quickly, I just wanted to add we did have a Transportation Committee report.

Mr. Howard: Oh, I apologize!

Mr. Fields: It just occurred to me. We'll be moving forward. We did take a good final look at the sidewalk plan, I guess, for lack of a better name, to try to see where the logical places where you could add sidewalks and create connectivity of stuff. And we took a good look, staff did a great job of presenting not only maps, detailed maps, but then they went out and did photographs of each of those segments so we could kind of visualize. And what we ended up doing is creating a... proposing a three-tier system. It became pretty evident that certain projects that are very logical provide a great deal of connectivity, then another layer that would be good but certainly would not be at the top of the list. And then the third group that's probably...

Mr. Rhodes: Challenged.

Mr. Fields: Probably not either challenging or at the end of the day doesn't provide that much access or to that many people. Rather than rank them in like in a total one through twenty-five order, it made sense to put them in broad groups. And so Mr. Rhodes was sent the material and he's been reviewing it and I assume that soon we will bring that forward for the whole Commission to look at.

Mr. Howard: That's great, thank you!

Mr. Fields: But it did provide a good look and hopefully it will provide a framework; of course, it's just a planning document, it has no financial constraints particularly attached. But hopefully as we go through, it will provide a much better guideline for some future transportation thinking.

Mr. Howard: Yeah, and that would be great to see people on sidewalks versus in the gutter walking.

Mr. Fields: And you realize that a few thousand feet of correctly placed sidewalk, particularly in North Stafford, would suddenly connect twenty or thirty thousand people in a way that they are completely disconnected.

Mr. Howard: Wow! That's great.

Ms. Kirkman: Along those lines, could the Transportation... I like suggesting work for other people... could the Transportation Committee take up next bike paths in the County? Basically, at this point, you're taking your life in your hands if you try and bike anywhere in Stafford County.

Mr. Howard: Or run, if you're a runner.

Ms. Kirkman: So, it would be great if you guys could do the same sort of project around biking paths and how to move around the County without using a car.

Mr. Howard: I think that's a good...

Mr. Rhodes: Cautiously.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mr. Howard: Even the Route 1 bike path is probably the most dangerous path you could ever ride. It's terrible.

Ms. Kirkman: It's a shoulder that they used CMAQ funds to pay for. Let's talk about what that scam was about.

Mr. Howard: I think it was about signs only, in my own opinion, after driving it.

Ms. Kirkman: I'm really serious. For a while the way that we were getting shoulders for our roads paid for was to use congestion mitigation funds and calling the shoulders a bike path, literally. That's how we got those.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT

Mr. Howard: Yeah, but that's not an accurate statement though. That's good. So, the Chairman's Report; I just wanted to again thank everyone who's worked on the Comprehensive Plan. This has been a long process; it's been longer than perhaps it needed to be. Nonetheless, we're here today with the Comp Plan for the County and we have to advance it forward in the best possible format and end product that we can come together on as a group, and I'm looking forward to that. I do want to thank Mrs. Roberts. Jeff, I echo your comments; Mrs. Roberts is clearly a very professional individual, a very caring individual, she cared a lot about the County. We're sorry to lose her as a resident; certainly sorry to lose her as a professional practicing attorney for the County of Stafford. She will be missed. We wish her well on her new endeavors. She has a great family. We hope they transition well in the State of Florida. I mean, how difficult could it be to be in ninety degrees every day for your whole life. It probably can't be too hard although I shouldn't be judgmental. She was an asset to the County and I certainly appreciate her wisdom and she is very, very professional and kept her cool in all cases and that's something I think I can learn from her myself. So, thank you Mrs. Roberts, wherever you are. And that concludes the meeting.

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman, the minutes.

OTHER BUSINESS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

May 19, 2010

Mr. Howard: Oh, we have to approve the minutes.

Mr. Mitchell: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion for approval of the May 19, 2010 Stafford Planning Commission Minutes.

Mr. Rhodes: Second.

Mr. Howard: Any discussion? Hearing none, we'll call for the vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Mr. Rhodes: Aye.

Planning Commission Minutes
July 7, 2010

Mrs. Hazard: Aye.

Mr. Fields: Aye.

Mr. Mitchell: Aye.

Ms. Kirkman: Aye.

Mr. Hirons: Aye.

Mr. Howard: Aye. Opposed? The motion carries 7-0. The meeting...

Mr. Rhodes: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Howard: Oh, it's almost...

Mr. Rhodes: I beat you to it.

Mr. Howard: I didn't hit the gavel yet.

Mr. Rhodes: Alright, not to be too redundant but having joined this body in the beginning of 2006 and confusingly starting on the Comprehensive Plan Committee, not knowing what I was getting into, and watching this staff work through forty-two meetings in the first fourteen months because we were meeting-happy, and then seeing them through the further iterations of the process the way they have produced the work that they have produced, especially under the circumstances and conditions over the last couple years of more constraining resources and increasing workload, I don't think we can say enough for the work product while we've got probably a few more months of work to do to move this forward. And then all that does is create more work because after there is a new Comprehensive Plan, then you have to do the implementation and all the other things. I don't think we can say enough for the efforts in addition to everything they do day-to-day to having put through all the processes and different focus areas and work and questions and other things that we have thrown at them, I just think it's been an amazing accomplishment. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Howard: Thank you Mr. Rhodes. The meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Gordon Howard, Chairman
Planning Commission